

AIR WAR COLLEGE

AIR UNIVERSITY

US MILITARY OVERSEAS BASES-
HOW THEY BEGAN AND THE ENDURING NEED FOR
FORWARD BASED UNITED STATES' TROOPS...

by

Addalyrica Q. George, COL, USA

A Research Report Submitted to the Faculty

In Partial Fulfillment of the Graduation Requirements

Advisor: (COL Dewey Mosley)

6 April 2017

The views expressed in this academic research paper are those of the author and do not reflect the official policy or position of the US government, the Department of Defense, or Air University. In accordance with Air Force Instruction 51-303, it is not copyrighted, but is the property of the United States government.

.



Biography

COL Addalyrica George entered the United States Army in 1994. She served as an executive officer, 516th Personnel Service Company, Camp Walker, Republic of Korea; strength management officer, Information Signal Command, Fort Huachuca, Arizona; assistant operations officer, Charlotte MEPS, North Carolina; company commander, 55th Postal Company, Hanau, Germany; brigade adjutant, 37th Transportation Command, Kaiserslautern, Germany; chief of Strength Management, personnel officer, and brigade human resources officer, 2nd Recruiting Brigade, Fort Gillem, Georgia; brigade human resources officer 93rd/35th Signal Brigade, Fort Gordon, Georgia; chief, Army Strength Management Branch and special assistant to the commander, United States Africa Command, Stuttgart, Germany; Ministry of Defense senior advisor and executive officer, for the deputy commanding general, Programs, NATO training mission/Combined Security Transition Command, Camp Eggers, Afghanistan; and human resources officer and later director, Human Resource Sustainment Center, 8th Theater Sustainment Command, Fort Shafter, Hawaii. COL George's last assignment was Commander, 9th Battalion, United States Military Entrance Processing Command, and the Dallas Military Entrance Processing Station.

Colonel George completed the Command and General Staff College, Human Resource Management Course, Company Commander's Course, Combined Arms and Service Staff School, Adjutant General Officer Advanced Course and Adjutant General Officer Basic Course. She earned a Bachelor of Science from Albany State University, Georgia, and a Master of Business Administration in 2011 from the University of Phoenix, Arizona. Her awards and decorations include the Bronze Star Medal, two Defense Meritorious Service Medal, four Meritorious Service Medals, the Joint Service Commendation Medal, four Army Commendation Medals, two Army Achievement Medals, three Joint Meritorious Unit Awards, and various unit and service medals and ribbons.

Abstract

Since the turn of the century the US has established military bases overseas as part of a commitment to alliances, for different reason like constabulary forces, stabilizing the region, aid in nation rebuilding, or show of force to contain and deter opponents. This paper will examine a historical thread of circumstances which led to a US presence overseas. It focuses on selected presidents, during a significant era, and their foreign policy, leading to an understanding on how and why overseas bases started, the utility of these bases, and the necessity for the new administration to continue maintaining some type of US military presence overseas. It leads off with a discussion on George Washington and other prominent statesmen's role in the birth of US foreign policy, isolationism. The paper goes on to discuss President Theodore Roosevelt and his policy of expansionism, evolving with the start of US military forces, primarily naval, overseas to protect US interest. The paper continues by discussing FDR and President Truman advancement into interventionism during WWII and the Cold War era. It was during the Cold War era when America would see its largest footprint of US forces overseas. The main body of the paper ends with the Post-Cold war era discussing Bush 41, Clinton, Bush 43, and Obama's transformation of US forces in size and posture. The paper ends recommending to the new administration, the United States should maintain an appropriately prominent overseas posture in order to provide the administration flexibility in achieving its national security objectives.

Introduction

America, since its independence, has ripened from a small nation-state with limited resources, influence, or agreements with other nations, to a worldwide influential super nation. It was at the end of the 19th century when Americans started swaying its' views from isolationism/noninterventionism through expansionism to interventionism evolving into a prominent world super power. Transformation for the United States' (US) foreign policy views started at the turn of the 20th century, initiating many changes and creating a foundation for successes of the young nation. One significant element of the changes was the US military and the utility of its presence on foreign soil (overseas). History shows how the US grew from a limited military force, with nonexistent desires to occupy any other nations' territory,, to a preeminent global military force, comprehensively understanding the effectiveness of its' presence in other countries during World War II (WW II), and the necessity of long-term occupation after the war, soon to be known as the Cold War Period.^{a1} Presently, the US still occupies some of the same overseas bases, structured during the Cold War era, and through much coordination, has set-up newer bases during the last century due, mostly, to existential circumstances threatening America and its' allies around the world. Consequently, the end of the Cold War dramatically altered the global landscape bringing about a significant reduction of US forces, and change, in the military posture. The military posture has since been an enduring concern with each new administration entering the presidential office.

The current presidential administration has yet to establish a foreign policy or national security strategy. The rhetoric depicted while campaigning, and since assuming office, has been about 'changing the US involvement with NATO or reducing America's commitment to

^a Cold War Era-more about background further in the paper.

international security'. The ambiguous views of this administration has stirred up concerns about the prospect of US international relations, particularly, the disposition of US military forces. Since the turn of the century the US has established military bases overseas for different reason like constabulary forces, stabilizing the region, or detaining adversaries. As new and unpredictable threats emerge, the United States should maintain an overseas posture in order to provide the administration flexibility in achieving its national security objectives, howbeit, the force should be more versatile, less costly, less vulnerable, and appropriately distributed, overseas posture. Examining a historical thread of circumstances leading to a US presence overseas will offer an understanding on how and why overseas bases started, the utility of these bases, and the necessity to continue maintaining US military presence overseas.

Background

The US military, under the charge of General George Washington, was formed as a defense force when America engaged in a fight for independence against the British. General Washington would go on to become the first US President. He, along with other prominent leaders, presided over the birth of US policies, building a solid foundation for America. These leading statesmen, calling for neutrality and noninterventionism, were keen with keeping America out of other nations' affairs. "Until the end of the nineteenth century, American foreign policy essentially followed the guidelines laid down by George Washington, in his Farewell Address to the American people: The great rule of conduct for us in regard to foreign nations is—in extending our commercial relations—to have with them as little political connection as possible."² It was noted, the isolationist principle set the tone of how America would not roam the globe trying to colonize other countries.³ Historian Ralph Raico stated "the noninterventionist America, devoted to solving its own problems and developing its own

civilization, became the wonder of the world.”⁴ Towards the end of the nineteenth century a different philosophy began to emerge; noninterventionist ideas were fading and the desire for imperialism was spreading from Europe. While most Americans were content with its international relations, via trading and commercial imports/exports, they were divided politically on foreign alliances and colonization beliefs. The new drift became the establishment of settlements and coaling stations around the globe, with the design of vast armies and navies to protect the land. This imperialism found an echo in the US, as America became involved with a string of conflicts; the war with Spain, the war for the conquest of the Philippines, and ultimately entry into the First World War, (WWI), signaling her turning point towards expansionism and representing an overwhelming swing with America’s foreign policy.⁵ Early American expansion did not allow military force, on US overseas territories, (Pearl Harbor, on the Hawaiian island of Oahu, and Pago Pago Harbor in Samoa Islands), primarily due to Congress refusing to appropriate any resources to these territories.⁶ It wasn’t until after the US victory in the 1898 Spanish-American War and governance over regions in the Far East and the Caribbean, when America established her first permanent abroad military base from a constabulary viewpoint to secure the newly attained possessions and to enable US forces to project stability and order within these regions.⁷

At the turn of the century, an energized innovator, Theodore Roosevelt, was sworn in as president due to the assassination of the newly elected President William McKinley. President Roosevelt was noted as being one to “go against the grain” depending on the circumstances. His vision for the US was to come out of its noninterventionist manner of beliefs and assume its responsibility a global power. He was quoted saying “America should ‘speak softly and carry a big stick’ in the realm of international affairs and that its’ president should be willing to use force

to back up his diplomatic negotiations. Holding true to his image, it was the President's 'big stick' metaphor that brought the corollary to the Monroe Doctrine of 1823. The doctrine was implemented for the Europeans to cease trying to influence or occupy any land in America's sphere of the world. The addendum to the doctrine avowed that the US might intervene in the affairs of an American nation threatened with seizure or intervention by European country, if they didn't adhere to the doctrine. As the corollary worked out in practice, the United States increasingly used military force to restore internal stability to nations under its authority. Roosevelt declared that the United States might 'exercise international police power in 'flagrant cases of such wrongdoing or impotence'.⁸

In 1912, Woodrow Wilson, a progressive leader in the movement that advocated using the full power of government to create 'real democracy' at home, was elected president, and his horizons were much broader than the United States. Preaching the gospel of 'making the world safe for democracy,' he aimed to extend the progressive creed to the ends of the earth. He was noted as the patron saint of the "exporting democracy" clique in America today.⁹ Before WWI the United States often deployed its vessels in 'combat-credible force packages' to signal American resolve. Under President Wilson, the US military sustained its works to become an effective actor on the global scene, involving in exploits both in its conventional dominance in the Americas and in Europe during WWI¹⁰. Although many Americans rallied to join President Wilson's crusade making the world "safe for democracy", critics would later argue about US involvement in WWI being driven by money grabbers with business connections overseas, fueling a growing 'isolationist' movement, wanting the US to steer clear of future wars, remain neutral, and avoid financial deals with countries at war.¹¹ Throughout this period, with the exception of the legation guards and the Yangtze River Patrol stationed in China, the US military

presence overseas was small and based solely on US territories. Development of the existing US overseas garrisons remained stunted for three reasons: inter-service disagreements location, budgetary constraints, and the limitations on fortifying bases noted treaty signed after WWI.¹² As a fall out from WWI, and the great depression, isolationism reared its' head back for a brief period prior to WWII. During this period, the US leaders published a series of 'acts', with title changes and addendums when needed, initially preventing anyone in the US from supporting or getting involved in any other nation's conflict, eventually changing to provide aide and assistance at the start of WWII. The act ultimately dissolved once the US entered WWII in support of the Allied powers fight against the Axis powers.

WW II

The first few years of the war set the stage for the prompt base expansion that would convey the shift toward offensive operations in the European and Pacific theaters during the last two years of the War.¹³ Noted on the US Department historian site was "during that first year of WWII, the United States began to provide significant military supplies and other assistance to the Allies in September 1940, even though the United States did not enter the war until December 1941. Much of this aid flowed to the United Kingdom and other nations already at war through an innovative program known as Lend-Lease."¹⁴ In 1940, President FD Roosevelt began the transformation of the US from one of the world's influencer into a global superpower, with unparalleled military might, signifying the beginning of protracted military presence overseas. Of particular, he brokered a deal with Great Britain, ultimately attaining control over a collection of air and naval bases in their colonies.¹⁵ After the agreement with England, the US made an agreement, with a Danish representative, (at that time Greenland and Ireland were Danish possessions), to allow American forces to set up bases in Greenland resulting in US

troops arriving in Ireland the summer of 1941.¹⁶ In December 1941, the attack on Pearl Harbor would ignite the US and generate an awareness of America's vulnerability, dismissing the years of assuming the US would be safe if she remained impartial to world affairs. The attack also resulted in President Roosevelt tasking the Joint Chiefs of Staff (JCS) with developing a postwar overseas basing plan. The results of this plan propose a network of air bases lying along the perimeters of the European and Asian continents which would allow US to project power into these areas, while simultaneously precluding their use by other countries. The defensive stance was designed so the US would be positioned to respond to threats wherever they might materialize.¹⁷ "The US left WW II with the notion that its extensive overseas basing system was a legitimate and necessary instrument of US power, morally justified and a rightful symbol of the US role in the world."¹⁸

Cold War

The war, and its aftermath, brought about many changes and challenges for America. Restructuring the massive US forces was a daunting task, particularly with the unknown variables of what size should the force be, the new national and international security policy, and how would all of this affect US forces.¹⁹ Downsizing was the initial requirement for restructuring the US forces and about half the militaries shrinking force remained overseas, with the buck occupying Germany and Japan. "The total amount of installations setup by the US during the war and the resources invested in them, pressed America into the alignment of a post-war global security system on these facilities, letting it be known, not only does the US plan to retain some the established wartime bases but acquire more."²⁰ On 7 August 1945, President

Truman's gave remarks after the Potsdam Conference^b about the intent to retain some of the bases erected during the war as well as establish additional ones, he states "though the United States wants no profit or selfish advantage out of this war, we are going to maintain the military bases necessary for the complete protection of our interests and of world peace. Bases which our military experts deem to be essential for our protection we will acquire. We will acquire them by arrangements consistent with the United Nations Charter^c."²¹ Adhering to the occupation policy of the Potsdam Conference, the Allied Powers, America, France, Great Britain, and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics (USSR), established the Allied Control Council and assumed joint authority, in four separate zones, over Germany. The Powers' purpose was to collectively rebuild the German nation by abolishing Nazi propaganda, laws, and organizations by implementing new proclamations, laws, orders, directives, and structure. Although each Council member had administrative authority over their zone, all national matters were to be presented before the entire Council team, who could only execute by unanimous agreement on final decisions. Disagreements and failure to achieve consensus on many nationwide matters inevitably divided the Powers. The USSR severed ties with the Council resulting in a distinctive divided nation; a communist—socialist republic of East Germany and a capitalist—federal republic of West Germany.²²

The USSR global communism movement agenda was an unforeseen action and a significant challenge evolving into the 'Cold War Era', and a thorn in America's side for decades. These actions would bring the US to create and impose two important policies, the Truman Doctrine

^b The Potsdam Conference, 1945. The Big Three—USSR leader Joseph Stalin, British Prime Minister Winston Churchill (replaced on July 26 by Prime Minister Clement Attlee), and U.S. President Harry Truman—met in Potsdam, Germany, from July 17 to August 2, 1945, to negotiate terms for the end of World War II. <https://history.state.gov/milestones/1937-1945/potsdam-conf>.

^c The Charter of the United Nations (also known as the UN Charter) of 1945 is the foundational treaty of the United Nations, an intergovernmental organization. As a charter, it is a constituent treaty, and all members are bound by its articles. <https://treaties.un.org/doc/publication/ctc/uncharter.pdf>

and the Marshall plan. The Truman Doctrine encompassed a range of diplomatic, economic, and military tactics to preclude the extent of communism, augmenting America's security and impact overseas. The Marshall Plan was a plan to help Europe recover from the war using American money. "The Truman Doctrine effectively reoriented U.S. foreign policy away from its usual stance of withdrawal from regional conflicts not directly involving the US, to one of possible intervention in faraway conflicts. Truman argued that the US could no longer stand by and allow the forcible expansion of USSR totalitarianism into free, independent nations, because American national security now depended upon more than just the physical security of American territory."²³

In the Pacific, Japan's occupation was opposite to Germany's due to the Japanese insistence of being under only the control of the US and maintaining their same emperor/government. On another note, demands and dissent in Korea, similar to the occupation of Germany, would again prevent the US and the USSR from a solid post-war collaborative partnership, a divided peninsula-North and South Korea, and an impending national conflict between the two.²⁴ Noted in an article by the US Center of Military History was "in 1948 the USSR installed a communist government in North Korea that promoted an insurgency in South Korea in an attempt to bring down the recognized government and gain jurisdiction over the entire peninsula. Not quite two years later, the North undertook a direct attack, sending the North Korea People's Army south across the 38th parallel on June 25, 1950, marking the beginning of a civil war between a divided nation and the first military conflict during the Cold War era."²⁵ America deployed forces the following month in support of South Korea. The conflict lasted three years resulting in, the North Koreans failing to obtain their end state of assailing and taking authority of the South, and more permanent bases for the US. The actions by the North had a significant effect on American

foreign policy globally. The war persuaded the American leaders to continue a military presence in Asia. “Acceptance of military power as an indispensable and open partner in the conduct of foreign relations represented a basic change in the American approach to international affairs. Previously the nation had mobilized its latent military strength only under the threat of conflict.”²⁶ The Cold War era, policy of containment, would bring about the atomic age creating an arms race between the super powers. America, in an effort to contain battle with the USSR, would go on to sign additional agreements with different nations, spread US forces globally, and engage in conflicts^d within those nations. The US presence, though not always welcomed, was significant and beneficial throughout the Cold War era, ending in 1991 with the disbandment of the USSR.

Post-Cold War

During the Post-Cold War era leaders of America notably reshaped its’ defense posture, shutting down many installations and reducing the number of troops stationed in Europe, though building up in the Middle East. Presidents Bush (41) and Clinton’s administrations presided over studies, the Base Force and Bottom- Up Review (BUR) respectively, examining how to adapt the US defense strategy and force posture to this new strategic environment.²⁷ George H.W. Bush was described as an internationalist who devoted much of his time to foreign affairs. During his tenure a strategy was outlined, to adjust to disintegration of USSR in Europe and the escalating of small scale duress in other parts of the world, for the US stating an existence of US forces will remain an essential element abroad and possess capabilities to quickly react and respond to threats which may occur in any junction of the world.²⁸ This strategy established wide-range boundaries for the defense planning changing the focus from global to regional

^d The Vietnam War was a long, costly armed conflict that pitted the communist regime of North Vietnam and its southern allies, known as the Viet Cong, against South Vietnam and its principal ally, the United States. <http://www.history.com/topics/vietnam-war/vietnam-war-history>

duress and from a forward defense to a forward presence posture.²⁹ Bush 41 didn't secure a consecutive term in the 1992 election and he would be replaced by William 'Bill' Clinton. Clinton was noted for campaigning on a platform of domestic affairs as a priority and beliefs that the previous administration's drawdown of the armed forces wasn't enough. His administration downsized the US forces extensively becoming the most troubling trend while in office, and drastically declined the troops morale. The smaller force faced a slew of post-Cold War commitments that, coupled with mistakes in management, placed significant strain on military personnel."³⁰ His administration would also appear as reneging on a security commitment the US assumed after WW I, instilling fear amongst her allies that she might return to a policy of isolation.³¹ These fears wouldn't last as President Clinton would eventually engaged troops in conflict going on around the globe in support of the US Allies, ultimately shifting his views and foreign policy to interventionism.

After Clinton's eight years in office, George W. Bush (43) was elected and his conservatism administration entered office unanticipated for what was about to turn America and the view they campaigned on, upside down. After September 11, 2001^e, the administration was convinced that significant modifications were required to deal with the changing security environment and unknown threat. "It was in this complex strategic environment, this administration felt it could not confidently identify all the potential types of threats it might confront; who its enemies might be, and where or when, they might strike."³² The administration foreign policy shifted to a neo-conservatism/interventionist and in an effort to combat these unpredictable and unknown threats. Oddly, the mission for the US forces overseas, 'providing direct territorial defense', had not changed since 2001 prompting a request for a comprehensive, strategy-based reassessment of the

^e On September 11 2001, a series of four coordinated terrorist attacks by the Islamic terrorist group al-Qaeda on the United States.

size, location, types, and capabilities needed for US forward military force. The request was formally named the global defense posture review, (GDPR), forming a think tank of policymakers, senior military and civilian leaders from the pentagon, interagency personnel, and combatant commanders of whom the finished product, the global defense posture, (GDP)^f would directly or indirectly impact, depending on the region.

The horrendous attack on US soil provoked Bush 43 to demand the release of Osama bin Laden and members of al-Qaeda from the Taliban (another hostile organization in Afghanistan), who wouldn't comply without proof of al-Qaeda's involvement with attack. The denial was presumed as a delay tactic inciting Bush 43 to declare war on terror and send US forces to invade Afghanistan with an end-state of demolishing al-Qaeda and removing any authority of the Taliban. Subsequently, the US would deploy forces to Iraq to expel its current leader. The invasion of Afghanistan occurred in 2001 and the invasion of Iraq occurred in 2003 and both, currently, still have troops based in their countries. These two mentioned conflicts evolved into establishing temporary bases for the troops as they took on counterterrorism missions, counterinsurgency missions, training and advising their forces, and some mixtures of nation building. Since the war on terror was still ongoing as Bush 43 prepared to leave office, many of the reforms initiated under his GDPR were still in the process of being implemented as the new administration, Barrack Obama, prepared to take over. President Obama campaigned on shifting priorities and keeping America safe, ending the protractive conflicts, and bringing troops home. Upon taking office, "the Obama administration began a new posture review to determine how to make the forces more strategically sound, operationally resilient, and politically sustainable. The review concluded the US must maintain a posture of 'sustained forward engagement,' however,

^f GDP processes apply to DoD's forces, footprints, and agreements that support joint and combined global operations and plans in foreign countries and U.S. territories and in defense of the homeland, incorporating the meticulous research of several significant high ranking civilian and military leaders, in key positions.

due to declining budgets it would to identify which region was the priority to allocate US forces and resources accordingly.”³³ Engulfed with national issues and domestic policies, like his predecessors, President Obama would be consumed with everything going on internationally, resulting his changing his views and being identified as a pragmatic internationalist. During his two elected terms, Obama would oversee the capture of Osama bin Laden, drone attack a few nations, withdraw all forces out of Iraq but eventually send a smaller number back to assist Iraqi forces in the impending battle against a jihadist group; increase, decrease, but never fully withdrawing the troops from Afghanistan. In addition, he would also send strategic teams out to different contingencies going on throughout the globe, intervene in removing a sadistic leader in Libya, deploy troops to other locations in the Middle East, throughout Africa, and the Balkans, all in support of national interest. Most notable during his term were vast downsize of forces under sequestration and a posture shift to the Pacific. President Obama’s National Security Strategy would highlight this change of force power, setting the stage for the type and location of engagements the US would likely engage in the future, bearing significant weight on the value of military presence overseas.

Maintaining the Status Quo

“The US global defense posture has gone through enormous changes over the past two centuries, which is hardly surprising, given that the United States has evolved from a weak, isolated, newly independent nation into a global power with an extensive portfolio of alliances and security interests around the world.”³⁴ Currently, the US posture has forces deployed approximately in more than 100 countries around the world, with over 300,000 of its active-duty personnel serving outside the United States and its territories. There is an audiences of Americans who think the price for military bases too costly and no longer a viable purpose to

start here---have US forces overseas, expressing ‘the military can respond to any threat or provide the same support from US soil’. While campaigning, candidate Donald Trump conveyed his lack of understanding the value of US bases overseas and how he would consider withdrawing US forces from overseas bases if Allies failed to contribute more toward the costs of keeping them there. Anthropologist David Vine argues in his book *Base Nation*, about unnecessary money invested on US overseas bases, describing how military’s overseas presence brings more harm than good, builds the host nation’s economy, weakens America’s domestic security, bankrupts America’s economy, and little, if any, research suggests that overseas bases are needed and an effective form of long-term deterrence³⁵. Although some of points by these individuals are noteworthy, one cannot put a price on freedom, peace, and security of a nation. Threats to America’s interests today come from five sources: super powers, rogue states, radical nonstate actors, epidemics and environmental instability, and advances in technology that could increase US liabilities.³⁶ These threats attest a need for military presence in key regions around the world. Further supporting evidence is in the 2016 Military Index, its’ analysis states,

Russia possesses the largest nuclear weapons arsenal among the nuclear powers. It is one of the few nations with the capability to destroy many targets in the U.S. homeland and in U.S.-allied nations and to threaten and prevent other nations from having free access to the commons. Moscow has repeatedly threatened U.S. allies in Europe with nuclear deployments and even pre-emptive nuclear strikes. There have been 577 terrorist attacks in 41 countries, in which 4037 people were killed and 4795 injured this year and over 2477 attacks in 59 countries, in which 21240 people were killed and 26680 injured.^g Threats to the homeland include both terrorist threats from non-state actors’ resident in ungoverned areas of South Asia. North Korea has made several verbal threats against attacking US and China’s long-standing threat to end de facto independence of Taiwan and ultimately to bring it under the authority of Beijing—if necessary, by force—is both a threat to a major American security partner and a threat to the American interest in peace and stability in the Western Pacific.³⁷

^g Stats on terrorist attacks. <https://www.thereligionofpeace.com/attacks/attacks.aspx?Yr=2017>

Although money spent on overseas military bases is contentious for President Trump, there are other factors the POTUS should consider besides ‘money’ when regarding the disposition of military overseas posture. This administration needs to acquire a full comprehensive understand of all the military does at home and abroad, conduct a GDPR, learn from previous presidents’ decision making rights and wrongs, and assess historical and current global threats before making decisions on the military force structure and posture. A GDPR can better guide the on the exact type, size, and locations for the forces. As new and unpredictable threats emerge, the US will need an integrated strategy to posture her forces in any region and provide the administration flexibility in achieving its national security objectives (NSO). The understanding of these threats and their effects on the US should reveal to the current administration the need for US forces overseas. This administration must understand and accept that “the national interests the US military needs to advance remain constant: protecting the homeland; safeguarding US citizens at home and abroad; and ensuring the security of US allies, the global economy, and international order more generally.”³⁸

Conclusion

National interest has been the nucleus for the US establishing provisional bases abroad since the first half of the 20th century and the US has immersed its military in different types of stability or restoration operation since its’ origin. Unfortunately, for many reasons, money was not always available to incorporate basing plan. The US overseas posture has changed throughout the years, influenced by America’s interests in expansionism, fighting the spread of communism, improving security relationships/partnerships, and assurance and deterrence by show of force. As different and volatile threats arise, the US must assert its power and strategically position the military overseas to respond rapidly and effectively to the threat.

Analyzing the history of US military presence overseas, the size of the force, why they were executed, and why they changed, can provide insights to the current administration as they prepare to write policy defining military posture, especially overseas, in the coming term.



Endnotes

¹ Pettyjohn, Stacie L. U.S. Global Defense Posture, 1783–2011. Santa Monica, CA: RAND Corporation, 2012. <http://www.rand.org/pubs/monographs/MG1244.html,1>.

² Raicon, Ralph, “American Foreign Policy: The Turning Point, 1898-1919”, Independent Institute, 1 February 1995, <http://www.independent.org/newsroom/article.asp?id=1345>.

³ Ibid.

⁴ Ibid.

⁵ Ibid.

⁶ Ibid.

⁷ RAND Corporation. *Overseas Basing of US Military Forces*. Santa Monica, CA: RAND Corporation, 2013,6.

⁸ Office of the Historian, “Roosevelt Corollary to the Monroe Doctrine 1904”, <https://history.state.gov/milestones/1899-1913/roosevelt-and-monroe-doctrine>

⁹ Ibid

¹⁰ Raicon, “American Foreign Policy”.

¹¹ Office of the Historian, “The Neutrality Acts 1930s”, <https://history.state.gov/milestones/1921-1936/neutrality-acts>

¹² Pettyjohn, U.S. Global Defense Posture, 35.

¹³ Sandars, C. T. *America's Overseas Garrisons*. Oxford, NY: Oxford University Press Inc, 2000, 12.

¹⁴ Office of the Historian, “Lend-Lease and Military Aid to the Allies in the Early Years of World War II”, <https://history.state.gov/milestones/1937-1945/lend-lease>.

¹⁵ Vine, David, *Base Nation: How US Military Bases Abroad Harm America and the World* (New York, NY: Metropolitan Books, 2015), 17.

¹⁶ Sandars, *Overseas Garrisons*, 4.

¹⁷ RAND Corporation. *Overseas Basing*, 6.

¹⁸ Blaker. *United States Overseas Basing*, 28.

¹⁹ US Army Center of Military History, *American Military History*, 529-530.
<http://www.history.army.mil/books/AMH/AMH-24.htm>

²⁰ Sandars, *Overseas Garrisons*, 5.

²¹ Ibid. 5

²² *American Military History*, 534.

²³ Office of the Historian, "The Truman Doctrine 1947",
<https://history.state.gov/milestones/1945-1952/truman-doctrine>.

²⁴ *American Military History*, 536.

²⁵ Ibid, 554.

²⁶ Ibid, 572.

²⁷ Pettyjohn, US Global Defense Basing, 83.

²⁸ Sandars, *Overseas Garrisons*, 308.

²⁹ Pettyjohn, U.S. Global Defense Posture, 84.

³⁰ O'Hanlon, Michael. "Clinton's Strong Defense Legacy." *Foreign Affairs* 82, no. 6 (2003): 126-34. doi:10.2307/20033762.

³¹ Sandars, *Overseas Garrisons*, 311.

³² Pettyjohn, U.S. Global Defense Posture, 86.

³³ Ibid, 12.

³⁴ Ibid, 110.

³⁵ Vine, Base Nation. 17

³⁶ O'Hanlon, Michael and David Petraeus. "America's Awesome Military: And how to make it Even Better." *Foreign Affairs* 95, no. 5 (2016), 10
<http://aufric.idm.oclc.org/login?url=http://search.proquest.com.aufric.idm.oclc.org/docview/1815340967?accountid=4332>.

³⁷ *2016 Military Index*. Heritage House. Retrieved 3 April 2017.
<http://index.heritage.org/military/2016/assessments/us-military-power>.

³⁸ O'Hanlon and Petraeus. "America's Awesome Military"



Bibliographies

- Arkes, Hadley. *Bureacraxy, the Marshall Plan and the National Interest*. Princeton, NY: Princeton University Press, 1972
- Blaker, James R. *United States Overseas Basing*. New York, New York : Praeger Publishers, 1990.
- Cooley, Alexander. *Base Politics: Democratic Change and the US Military Overseas*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 2008.
- Critchlow, Robert D. *US Military Overseas Basing: New Development and Oversight Issues for Congress*. Washington, DC: Congressional Research Service (CRS) Report of Congress The Library of Congress, 2005.
- Colin Dueck, *Reluctant Crusaders: Power, Culture, and Change in American Grand Strategy* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2006).
- Department of Defense Overseas Infrastructure Master Plans Continue to Evolve. Report to Congressional Committees, GAO-06-913R Defense Infrastructure. Washington, DC: US Government Accountability Office, 22 August 2006.
- Gaddis, John Lewis. *Russia, The Soviet Union and The United States*. New York: McGraw-Hill Publishing Company, 1990.
- Eric Schmitt, Michael R. Gordon. "As U.S. Escalates Air War on ISIS, Allies Slip Away." *New York Times*. Nov 7, 2015. <http://www.nytimes.com/2015/11/08/world/middleeast/as-us-escalates-air-war-on-isis-allies-slip-away.html> (accessed October 25, 2016).
- Friedman, Thomas L. *The World Is Flat – A Brief History of the Twenty-First Century*. New York, NY: Farrar, Straus and Giroux. (Walt Spring), 2005.
- Giordono, Joseph. "U.S. military plans to expand Camp Lemonier in Djibouti." *Stars and Stripes*, 9 July 2006. <http://www.stripes.com>.
- Houghton, David Patrick. *The Decision Point*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2013.
- Montiero, Nuno, "Conclusion" in *Theory of Unipolar Politics*. (New York, New York: Cambridge University Press, 2014) pp 205-32.
- RAND Corporation. *Overseas Basing of US Military Forces*. Santa Monica , CA: RAND Corporation , 2013.
- Robert E. Harkavy, Ryan Henry, Andrew S. Erickson, Justin D. Mikolay. *Reposturing the Force: US Overseas Presence in the Twenty-first Century*. Edited by Carnes Lord. Newport, RI: Naval War College Press, 2006.

Sandars, C. T. *America's Overseas Garrisons*. Oxford, NY: Oxford University Press Inc, 2000.

Suri, Jeremy. "American Grand Strategy from the Cold War's End to 9/11" *Orbis* 53, no. 4 (2009), pp. 611-627.

Terrill, W. Andrew. *Regional Fears of Western Primacy and the Future of US Middle Eastern Basing Policy*. Carlisle, PA: Strategic Studies Institute, 2006.

US Army Center of Military History, *American Military History*, 529-530.

<http://www.history.army.mil/books/AMH/AMH-24.htm>

Vine, David. *Base Nation: How US Military Bases Abroad Harm America and the World*. New York, NY: Metropolitan Books, 2015.

Walt, Stephen, "International Relations: One World, Many Theories," *Foreign Policy* (Spring 1998)

Walt, Stephen, "Why Alliances Endure or Collapse," *Survival* 39, no. 1 (Spring 1997),

Walt, Stephen, "Alliances in a Unipolar World," *World Politics* 61, no. 1 (January 2009), pp. 86–120.

Weitsman, Patricia A., "Wartime Alliances versus Coalition Warfare: How Institutional Structure Matters in the Multilateral Prosecution of Wars," *Strategic Studies Quarterly* 4, no. 2 (Summer 2010), pp. 113-136.

Williamson Murray and Allan R. Millett, *Military Innovation in the Interwar Period*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 1996.